

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Joint Application of AT&T Communications of California, Inc. (U 5002 C) and WorldCom, Inc. for the Commission to Reexamine the Recurring Costs and Prices of Unbundled Switching in Its First Annual Review of Unbundled Network Element Costs Pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 11 of D.99-11-050.

Application 01-02-024
(Filed February 21, 2001)

Application of AT&T Communications of California, Inc. (U 5002 C) and WorldCom, Inc. for the Commission to Reexamine the Recurring Costs and Prices of Unbundled Loops in Its First Annual Review of Unbundled Network Element Costs Pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 11 of D.99-11-050.

Application 01-02-035
(Filed February 28, 2001)

Application of The Telephone Connection Local Services, LLC (U 5522 C) for the Commission to Reexamine the Recurring Costs and Prices of the DS-3 Entrance Facility Without Equipment in Its Second Annual Review of Unbundled Network Element Costs Pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 11 of D.99-11-050.

Application 02-02-031
(Filed February 28, 2002)

Application of AT&T Communications of California, Inc. (U 5002 C) and WorldCom, Inc. for the Commission to Reexamine the Recurring Costs and Prices of Unbundled Interoffice Transmission Facilities and Signaling Networks and Call-Related Databases in Its Second Annual Review of Unbundled Network Element Costs Pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 11 of D.99-11-050.

Application 02-02-032
(Filed February 28, 2002)

Application of Pacific Bell Telephone Company (U 1001 C) for the Commission to Reexamine the Costs and Prices of the Expanded Interconnection Service Cross-Connect Network Element in the Second Annual Review of Unbundled Network Element Costs Pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 11 of D.99-11-050.

Application 02-02-034
(Filed February 28, 2002)

Application of XO California, Inc. (U 5553 C) for the Commission to Reexamine the Recurring Costs of DS1 and DS3 Unbundled Network Element Loops in Its Second Annual Review of Unbundled Network Element Costs Pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 11 of D.99-11-050.

Application 02-03-002
(Filed March 1, 2002)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING
REQUIRING RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS REGARDING
EXTENSION OF INTERIM PORT DISCOUNT**

After reading the comments and reply comments (filed 6/4 and 6/12, respectively) on the issue of whether to extend the interim port discount to other port types, I have additional questions for Catherine Pitts (Declarant for AT&T

Communications of California and Worldcom Inc., hereinafter “Joint Applicants”) and Scott Pearsons (Declarant for Pacific Bell Telephone Company, or “Pacific”). I have appended my questions to this ruling and I am now asking that Joint Applicants and Pacific obtain additional sworn declarations from their respective declarants, Ms. Pitts and Mr. Pearsons, to answer the questions set forth in the attachment.

I request responses only from Ms. Pitts and Mr. Pearsons at this time. In other words, I am not soliciting filings from other parties. Joint Applicants and Pacific should keep their Declarants' responses limited to my questions.

Responses with sworn declarations are due no later than 5:00 p.m. on July 11, 2002. Joint Applicants and Pacific should file and serve their responses in the normal fashion, with an electronic copy to dot@cpuc.ca.gov.

Therefore, **IT IS RULED** that Joint Applicants and Pacific Bell Telephone Company shall file declarations responding to the questions attached to this ruling no later than 5:00 p.m. on July 11, 2002.

Dated July 9, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ DOROTHY J. DUDA

Dorothy J. Duda
Administrative Law Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have by mail this day served a true copy of the original attached Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Requiring Responses to Additional Questions Regarding Extension of Interim Port Discount on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record.

Dated July 9, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ FANNIE SID

Fannie Sid

N O T I C E

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.

ATTACHMENT

Questions for Joint Applicants' Declarant Catherine Pitts

1. Joint Applicants' reply comments of June 12, 2002 imply that all the non-basic ports at issue--namely Coin Port, Centrex Port, DID Port, DID Number Block, ISDN Port, Trunk Port Termination (End Office Termination and Tandem Termination), and DS-1 Port--have facilities and equipment in common with the basic port even if they also use additional equipment. Specifically, the reply comments state that "these other port types *use the same facilities and equipment included in the cost of the basic port, usage and feature rate elements for which the Commission adopted the interim cost reductions.*" (Reply Comments, 6/12/02, p. 2.) (Emphasis in original.) Do you agree with this statement? If not, describe which ports do not have equipment in common with the basic port. If yes, describe the equipment in common for each port listed in this question.
2. Your declaration states that "the ISDN trunk port (PRI) does not use a different type of trunk port than a basic trunk." (Pitts Declaration, 6/12/02, footnote 4.) Are you saying that the ISDN port has some equipment in common with the basic port? If yes, describe the equipment in common. If no, explain the significance of ISDN and basic trunks using the same trunk port type.
3. You state that ISDN ports utilize different switch components that have not already been reduced. (Pitts Declaration, 6/12/02, paragraph 10.) Given this statement, explain why you believe that ISDN ports should be reduced in price.

Questions for Pacific Bell's Declarant Scott Pearsons

1. Ms. Pitt's declaration states that when SBC provisions a Centrex port, it is providing exactly the same port equipment that is

used for basic ports. (Pitts Declaration, 6/12/02, paragraph 4). Do you agree with this statement? If not, explain why.

2. Ms. Pitt's declaration states that the "common block" is a setting in the switch's memory chips and resides in the same memory chips that are used for basic switch call processing. (Pitts Declaration, 6/12/02, paragraph 5.) Do you agree with this statement? If not, explain why.
3. Your declaration states that Pacific's port types have different functionalities, involve different equipment, and therefore have different costs. (Pearsons Declaration, 6/12/02, paragraph 6.) Despite this statement, do you agree with Joint Applicants' statements that the ports at issue here--namely Coin Port, Centrex Port, DID Port, DID Number Block, ISDN Port, Trunk Port Termination (End Office Termination and Tandem Termination), and DS-1 Port--have some equipment and facilities in common with the basic port even if they also use additional equipment? If not, describe which ports do not have equipment in common with the basic port. If yes, describe the equipment in common for each port listed in this question.
4. Ms. Pitt's declaration states that end office and tandem trunk port elements are comprised of the same trunk equipment that are included in the rate elements for end office interoffice originating and terminating usage or tandem usage. (Pitts Declaration, 6/12/02, paragraph 7.) Do you agree with this statement? If not, explain why.
5. Ms. Pitt's declaration states that for all ports except the signaling cost portion of some coin ports and ISDN, the switch components are the same switch components that are either in the basic line port or usage rate element cost studies. (Pitts Declaration, 6/12/02, paragraph 10.) Do you agree with this statement? If not, explain why.

(END OF ATTACHMENT)